

REMARKS

By this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 1, 2, 4, and 7 for clarity and claims 4 and 7 to correct dependency. Applicants cancel claims 3, 5, 6, and 8 without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein, and Applicants add claims 9 and 10 that re-present and clarify the subject matter of canceled claims 3, 5, 6, and 8. Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 9, and 10 are pending in this application. No new matter is added. Applicants respectfully request consideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims at least in light of the following remarks.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiners Burge and Paula in the June 13 personal interview. Applicants incorporate a separate record of the substance of the interview into the following remarks.

The Office Action rejects claims 1- 8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent 5,878,421 to Ferrel et al. (hereinafter "Ferrel"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Initially, Applicants note that, by this Amendment, claims 3, 5, 6, and 8 are canceled. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 3, 5, 6, and 8 is inconsistent with the pending claims. However, because new claims 9 and 10 recite the subject matter of canceled claims 3, 5, 6, and 8, Applicants will address the rejection with respect to pending claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 9, and 10.

As discussed in detail during the personal interview, Ferrel does not disclose, teach, or suggest both first structural information and second structural information, each having a hierarchical structure. Further, Ferrel does not disclose, teach, or suggest that the second structural information includes a relation between elements of each partial structure in the first structural information. During the personal interview it was at least agreed that there were patentable differences between Ferrel and Applicant's disclosed invention in this respect. Accordingly, as suggested during the personal interview, Applicants amend claims 1

and 2 and add claims 9 and 10 in order to more clearly recite the patentable differences identified during the personal interview within the independent claims.

For example, as discussed during the personal interview, both the partial structures of the first structural information and the elements of the second structural information have hierarchical relationships. The Office Action relies on Figs. 9a and 10 and the associated disclosure as disclosing the claimed first structural information and second structural information.

During the personal interview, Examiners Burge and Paula pointed to Fig. 9a as disclosing hierarchical first structural information and hierarchical second structural information, as recited in claims 1, 2, 9, and 10. Examiners Burge and Paula explained that they considered, for example, section 1 and section 2 to be the first structural information and story 1, story 2, and story 3 to be the second structural information because story 1, story 2, and story 3 are elements of section 2. However, both section 1 and section 2 are on the same level of the tree shown in Fig 9a and thus do not have a hierarchical relationship. Similarly, story 1, story 2, and story 3 are on the same level of the tree shown in Fig 9a and thus do not have a hierarchical relationship. Accordingly, Fig 9a and the associated disclosure cannot reasonably be considered to disclose first structural information including a hierarchical relationship between partial structures or second structural information including a hierarchical structure between elements as recited in claims 1, 2, 9, and 10.

Similarly, during the personal interview, Examiners Burge and Paula pointed to Fig. 10 as disclosing hierarchical first structural information and hierarchical second structural information, as recited in claims 1, 2, 9, and 10. Examiners Burge and Paula explained that they considered, for example, section A, section B, and story C to be the first structural information since they are the 3 objects that make up the root title, and subsection A, story B, head 1014, and body 1016 to be the second structural information because story 1, story 2,

and story 3 are the respective elements of section A, section B, and story C. However, section A, section B, and story C are on the same level of the tree shown in Fig 10 and thus do not have a hierarchical relationship. Similarly, subsection A, story B, head 1014, and body 1016 are on the same level of the tree shown in Fig 10 and thus do not have a hierarchical relationship. Accordingly, Fig 10 and the associated disclosure cannot reasonably be considered to disclose first structural information including a hierarchical relationship between partial structures or second structural information inclosing a hierarchical structure between elements as recited in claims 1, 2, 9, and 10.


Applicants note that, for example, section A, section B, and story C are not shown on the same horizontal line in Fig. 10. Thus, one may assert that section A, section B, and story C are not on the same level. However, it is well know in the art, and disclosed in Ferrel, that the data structure the level of a relationship between elements in a tree structure is determined by the ancestor-child relationship, not a level on which the element is arbitrarily shown in a graphical representation (see col. 21, lines 28-38).

Because as discussed above, Ferrel cannot reasonably be considered to disclose first structural information including a hierarchical relationship between partial structures or second structural information inclosing a hierarchical structure between elements, claims 1, 2, 9, and 10 are patentable over Ferrel. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 4 and 7 are patentable for at least the reasons that claims 9 and 10 are patentable as well as for the additional features they recite. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

In view of at least the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Applicants earnestly solicit favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 9, and 10.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Jesse O. Collier
Registration No. 53,839

JAO:JOC/tea

Date: June 16, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--